REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 2 is amended and new claim 19 is added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended and new claim are respectfully requested. Claims 13-14, previously withdrawn by the Examiner, are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 2-4 and 19 are pending. Reconsideration is requested.

TRAVERSE OF REJECTIONS

I. On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects independent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Revashetti et al. (U.S.P. 6370,578) in view of Havens (U.S.P. 5,752,242).

Claim 2, as amended, recites an information presentation device in which a user terminal on a network retrieves products or services that match search parameters designated by the user including "(1) accepting a selection of a product or service that is included in said products or services that were retrieved based on the search parameters designated by the user; and . . . (2) storing said search parameters for the selected product or service as a candidate for purchase, selected product or service information, and (3) user identification information that identifies said user terminal (emphasis added)."

That is, according to aspects of the present invention as recited in claim 2, each users' reason for selecting a product/service, i.e., "search parameters designated designated by the user" and the background, i.e., user identification information of the users' desires can be learned by correlating a search condition, i.e., "match search parameters" used for searching products and services selected as purchase candidates, a selected product/service and a user identification information.

Applicants submit that these features are not taught by the cited art alone or in combination. Revashetti does not teach matching search parameters designated by the user and user identification information that identifies said user terminal as recited by claim 2.

Instead, Revashetti merely teaches that all the users are correlated with the same keyword.

Therefore, the effect of the present invention cannot be achieved by Revashetti even in an *arguendo* combination with Havens.

Further, Revashetti, alone or in combination, does not teach a storing of "identification information that identifies said user terminal." Rather, Revashetti merely teaches (col. 6, lines 60-62) a method to "analyze the current configuration of the client computer."

The Examiner contends Revashetii teaches search parameters are stored together "with user identification information that identifies said user terminal" since Revashetii teaches:

> analysis is particular to a given computer. . . and hence inherently must include identification of the client computer 208).

(Action at page 3).

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner contends the "basis for the inherency statement was set forth in the Office Action by reference to the passage in col. 6 lines 61-63 to "analyze the current configuration of the client computer."

Applicants are not questioning the disclosure of Revashetti, but rather the Examiner's statement of inherency that since Revashetti discloses analysis is particular to a given computer that "hence inherently must include identification of the client computer."

Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner provide support his conclusory statement of inherency.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states "that Applicant should not (have) mischaracterized the examiner's statement as being based on personal knowledge because he provides a specific reference to the specification in the art. col. 6 lines 61-63 on which the inherency observation was made."

Applicants are not characterizing the examiner's statement as being based on personal knowledge. Rather if the Examiner is basing his conclusory statement that Revashetti's disclosure on col. 6, lines 60-63 of a method to "analyze the current configuration of the client computer" inherently includes to "analyze the current configuration of the client computer," on personal knowledge and not another reference, as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) an affidavit be provided if called for the Applicants (who have requested the same).

In addition, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would look to modify a system taught by Revashetti that teaches marketing based on a current computer configuration with a system taught by Welsh of marketing of based on a predicted behavior.

Further, there is no discussion in Haven, nor has the Examiner provided a citation to such, to teach storing search parameters with "identification information that identifies said user terminal."

Rather, Havens merely teaches setting a narrowing-down condition for a search result for each user and that when search condition is inputted, a further result is extracted using the narrowing-down condition for each user from the search result obtained based on the search condition.

Therefore, Havens does not teach features according to an aspect of the present invention in which search information that a user designates for searching a product/service <u>and</u> a selected product/service are correlated and stored.

Since features recited by independent claim 2 are not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects dependent claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Revashetti in view of Havens in further view of Welsh.

Dependent claims 3-4 recite a device including "accepting user reference requests from first group of computer terminals on said network; and parameter providing means for extracting from said parameter storage means a first user identification information identifying said first user terminals that have selected a first product as a candidate for purchase that is provided by an administrator of a provider terminal included in said first computer terminals, and search parameters that each of said first user terminals has set to said first product, and providing them to said provider terminal."

The Examiner contends there is motivation to modify Revashetti and Havens with Welsh for "the ability to categorize(d) groups of users or people who like a certain product for ease in mass marketing." (Action at page 5).

Applicants submits one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to modify a system taught by Revashetti that teaches marketing based on a <u>current</u> computer configuration with a system taught by Welsh of marketing of based on a <u>predicted</u> behavior.

Since one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to modify Revashetti in a manner as the Examiner proposes, the rejection of claims 3-4 should be withdrawn.

Summary

Since *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 2-4 allowed.

New claim

New claim 19 is presented to recite features of the present invention in an alternate manner. Claim 19 recites an information presentation device including "correlating means for correlating search parameters designated by a user for searching products and services, identification information of the user, and product or service information; and outputting means for outputting a purchase candidate." These features of claim 19 patentably distinguish over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 10, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501